\neg	ᅮ	٨	_
•		Δ	

STAT

Approved For Release 2005/06/08 SEAREP79M00095A000200030005-5

The Director of Central Intelligence

	Washington, D.C. 20505	
Intelligence Community Staff	25 May 1977	
MEMORANDUM FOR:	See Distribution	
FROM :	Director of Performance Evaluation and Improvement	
SUBJECT :	PRM/NSC-11, Task 2	
meeting of the SC 1300 to 1400 on E Community Headquare 2. The purposubject report (Trevisions.	ector of Central Intelligence will chair a CC Subcommittee on Task 2 of PRM/NSC-11 from Friday, 27 May 1977, in Room 6W02 of the arters Building Oose of the meeting will be to review the Tab B) and to provide guidance for final eached (Tab A) is a proposed agenda of	STA ⁻
specific topics n committee.	meriting review and guidance by the sub-	STA ⁻
Attachment: Tab A - Propose	ed Agenda	
		STAT

STAT

Downgrade to UNCLASSIFIED upon removal of Tab B. SECRET

Approved For Release 2005/06/08 : CIA-RDP79M00095A 000200030005-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/08 SECRET P79M00095A000200030005-5

The Director of Central Intelligence

Washington, D.C. 20505

Intelligence Community Staff

25 May 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: See Distribution

STAT

FROM

Director of Performance Evaluation

and Improvement

SUBJECT

PRM/NSC-11, Task 2

For your information, here is the latest draft of the report required by PRM/NSC-11, Task 2. The DCI has scheduled a meeting of his SCC Subcommittee to review this draft on 27 May 1977.

Attachment: **STAT**

Downgrade to UNCLASSIFIED upon removal of Attachment

SECRET

Approved For Release 2005/06/08: CIA-RDP79M00095A000200030005-5

STAT

STAT

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2005/06/08: CIA-RDF79M00095A000200030005-5

PRM/NSC-11, Task 2

SCC Subcommittee Meeting 27 May 1977

"The Roles of the DCI and US Intelligence:
An Organizational Analysis"

Proposed Agenda of Topics for Guidance

1. FORWARD (Page iii)

The FOREWARD makes the point that the tasked subject (focused on the DCI) and the drafting assignment of this report prevented full justice being done to the interests of other major authorities over US intelligence, particularly the Secretary of Defense. Is this caveat necessary or adequate? The Department of Defense has a short, but comprehensive paper on the views and concerns of the Secretary of Defense that might well serve as a parallel submission to this report.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (Pages iv-x)

This is new material, not previously reviewed by Subcommittee representatives.

3. SECTION II, Basic Criteria for Organizational Judgment (Pages 5-11) (See footnote on Page 5.)

Is this section necessary or useful? The Department of Defense believes not.

4. Arms Control Monitoring and Verification (Pages 22-23)

This new, previously unreviewed, subsection covers a gap in earlier drafts. It has been suggested that a clearer distinction should be drawn between monitoring, which is an intelligence function, and verification, which is more a matter of political judgment and, therefore, the responsibility of the President, the National Security Council, and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Approved For Release 2005/06/06/1-65/4-RDP#9M00095A000200030005-5

5. Requirements, Planning, Programming, and Budgeting
Intelligence for the Future (Pages 35-41); and
parallel text submitted by the Department of Defense
for this subsection (Pages 41a-41d)

The Intelligence Community Staff draft, partly responsive to Department of Defense comments, tends to focus critically on the structural problems presented to the DCI by arrangements before and after Executive Order 11905. The Department of Defense draft tends to be less critical, emphasizes the potential of pre-Executive Order 11905 arrangements and the role of DCIs' personal proclivities, and the disadvantages of giving the DCI greater resource management responsibilities that may conflict with his other roles and intrude on departmental responsibilities. Subsection IV. C. 2. of the Assessment, pages 74-81, returns to these issues.

6. ANNEX: Figures, following Page 81.

Ten previously unreviewed figures are provided largely to present organizational and other data to the less informed reader that would otherwise burden an already lengthy text. Only Figure 6 should be contentious; it attempts to depict differing levels of DCI authority in Community management.